

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 20-22 and 27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11, and 21 are amended, and claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26, are canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Support for amendment to claims 1, 11 and 21 can be found at least in canceled claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Pappas in the telephone interviews held February 21, 2006 and April 4 2006, are appreciated. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interviews is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-12, 15, 16, 20-22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The rejection is moot with respect to canceled claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26, and respectfully traversed with respect to claims 1, 2, 10-12, 20-22 and 25-27.

The Office Action rejects the claims because of the subject matter "the depth cueing being set unrelated to a size and a shape of the object" allegedly does not comply with the written description requirement. However, as discussed during the telephone interview, although independent claim 1 recites that depth cueing being set, independent claims 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 were amended in the November 30, 2005 Supplemental Amendment to recite "depth cueing area being set unrelated to a size and a shape of the object." During the telephone interviews, Examiner Pappas requested support for this feature.

Support for "depth cueing area being set unrelated to a size and a shape of the object," can be found for example at page 17, lines 13-24, and Fig. 7 and the corresponding description. Specifically, it is implicit from page 17, lines 13-24, which states that "only under a condition that an object is within the depth cueing area . . .," that the depth cueing area is set unrelated to a size or shape of an object.

Moreover, Fig. 7 indicates that the processing of judging whether or not the Z-value is within the depth cueing area at step S3. It is clear from this processing that the depth cueing area is set by the Z-value, which is a depth value from a viewpoint. Therefore, the processing of Fig. 7, makes it possible to set the depth cueing area through, for example, selecting the Z-value, so that the depth cueing area is set with respect to a viewpoint. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the written description supports the feature, "the depth cueing area being set unrelated to a size or shape of an object," as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Further, claims 2, 12 and 22, which variously depend from independent claims 1, 11, and 21, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to these claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-12, 15, 16, 20-22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Foley ("Computer Graphics: Principles And Practice") in view of Deering (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0011618A1), and further in view of Griffin (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,904). The rejection is moot with respect to canceled claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26, and respectfully traversed with respect to claims 1, 2, 10-12, 20-22 and 27.

Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 20-22 and 27 would not have been rendered obvious by Foley in view of Griffin. None of the applied references teach or suggest "varying a depth cueing value for each vertex...; varying the alpha value for each vertex...," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11 and 21.

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Foley nor Deering teaches or suggests this feature. However, Griffin does not remedy the deficiencies of Foley and Deering. Griffin only discloses a vertex input processor that parses the input data stream and queues triangle data in the vertex control registers. The primitives queued in the vertex control registers are scanned by the pre-rasterizer to generate read requests for texture data blocks in a shared memory (col. 32, lines 55-67). Thus, Griffin does not teach or suggest "varying a depth cueing value for each vertex of the object based on a Z-value for each vertex of the object" or "varying the alpha value for each vertex of the object based on the Z-value for each vertex of the object," as recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 21.

Further, none of the applied references teaches or suggests "the depth cueing area being set unrelated to a size and a shape of the object," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27.

Foley only discloses the use of bounding boxes for identifying overlapped objects. The identification of overlapped objects using bounding boxes depends on the object shape. Further, Foley discloses clipping which is executed whether an object hides within a screen or not, which depends on the object size. Thus, Foley does not disclose ""the depth cueing area being set unrelated to a size and a shape of the object."

Deering and Griffin do not remedy this deficiency of Foley. Deering is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of varying an alpha value. Griffin is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of sorting objects of which alpha values are varied. Thus, Deering and Griffin do not disclose setting the depth cueing area unrelated to a size and shape of the object, as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 are patentable over Foley, Deering, and Griffin. Claims 2, 12, and 22, which depend variously from claims 1, 11, and 21, are also patentable over Foley, Deering and Griffin for at least the

reasons discussed with respect to the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hs

Date: April 10, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--